DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 253 539 SP 025 978

AUTHOR Saunders, Robert L.
TITLE Efforts to Reform Teacher Education in Tennessee: A Ten Year Analysis.
SPONS AGENCY National Commission on Excellence in Teacher Education (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE [84]
NOTE 29p.; For related document, see SP 025 975.
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Board of Education Role; *Change Strategies; *Educational Change; *Educational Legislation; Higher Education; *Policy Formation; Preservice Teacher Education; *Schools of Education; State Boards of Education; *State Standards; Teacher Education Programs
IDENTIFIERS National Commission on Excellence in Teacher Educ; *Tennessee

ABSTRACT

This paper describes the reform processes in teacher education in Tennessee over the past ten years. The decade of school improvement efforts, which culminated in 1984 with the passage of the Comprehensive Education Reform Act (CERA), is discussed. The paper presents: (1) a summary of action taken between 1975-80; (2) an account of the action taken in 1981-82, just prior to the passage of CERA; and (3) a description of provisions in CERA that deal directly with teacher education and of those provisions of the act that have implications for teacher education, both preservice and inservice. A description is given of the Better School Program in Tennessee which laid the foundations for passage of CERA. Included in the description is a discussion of the issues raised by the Better Schools Program, and of the legislative difficulties encountered in the passage of CERA. The implications of CERA for changes in schools of education are examined. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy

Efforts To Reform Teacher Education in Tennessee:

A Ten-year Analysis

Robert L. Saunders
Dean, College of Education
Memphis State University

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

R. Egbert

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ED253539

Introduction

Americans have always held high expectations for their schools. Periodically, the expectations elevate so quickly and so dramatically that schools experience serious credibility problems; indeed, in such periods schools are often branded as failures.

Such a condition was developing when in April, 1983, the National Commission on Excellence in Education reported A Nation at Risk. Quickly following were about two dozen other reports having similar thrusts and producing similar findings and recommmendations. Thus, within a relatively short period of time, about two years, the groundwork was laid for many governmental and regulatory agencies demanding major changes in American schools.

Distinguishing the current reform efforts from previous ones are the comprehensiveness of concerns, their intensity, and the fact that for the first time in history the primary action arena is not in Washington, D.C., but rather in the various states. The Education Commission of the States reports, for example, that throughout the country over 260 task forces are at work on the task of improving education.

No state has been more heavily involved than Tennessee in the debate about schools' shortcomings and what is needed to improve them. For the past 20 months intensive debate has taken place within the state, crescendoing in March, 1984, when Governor Lamar Alexander signed into law the Comprehensive Education Reform Act of 1984 and The Public School Governance Act which

SP025 978

established a new state board of education with a significantly different composition, role and function.

The Comprehensive Education Reform Act dramatically accelerated and elevated the State's efforts to improve schools as well as teacher education programs. Actually, the CERA was a follow-up of the Governor's Better Schools Program presented to the legislature a year earlier. Only one of the ten provisions in the Better Schools Program (transferring control of post-secondary vocational education programs from the State Board of Education to the State Board of Regents of the State University and Community College System of Tennessee) was enacted by the 1983 legislature. The other nine provisions, including the centerpiece of the program, the Master Teacher Program, was carried over for a year and assigned by the legislature to a Select Committee on Education for protracted study, fact finding, and debate. The Select Committee's findings and recommendations formed the basis for the proposed CERA and was the major item in the Extraordinary Session of the 1984 General Assembly called by the Governor on January 4, 1984. The final version incorporated the remaining nine of the Governor's earlier ten recommendations.

The remainder of this paper is divided into three parts: (1) a summary of actions taken between 1975-80, (2) action taken in 1981-82, just prior to the passage of CERA, and (3) a description of provisions in the CERA that dealt directly with teacher education and those provisions of the Act that have implications for teacher education, both preservice and inservice.

Teacher Education Improvement Efforts Between 1975-80

For about a quarter of a century, 1953-75, the state of Tennessee relied on its version of the approved program concept to monitor and control teacher education. Although the processes by which programs were monitored and evaluated changed from time to time, and content requirements for various

certificates changed through the years, such changes were rather minor in nature and essentially were initiated and recommended by the professional community. Beginning in 1975, however, (eight years before the "Nation at Risk" report) change initiatives shifted from professional education groups to the State Board of Education and the General Assembly.

Major change initiatives and their sources during this period were as follows:

1. In 1975, the State Board of Education ruled that effective July 1, 1980, all graduates of teacher education programs must have completed a course or equivalent experience dealing with the characteristics of handicapped students. The genesis of the decision was two-fold: Similar requirements had been passed in neighboring states, and Tennessee was at that time experiencing litigation with a movement that was later to become a national policy in the form of PL 94-142, The Education of All Handicapped Students Act. Teacher education programs in Tennessee experienced little difficulty in adjusting to the new requirement.

2. In 1978, the State Board of Education, without advance notice, mandated that students could be admitted to teacher education programs only if they made satisfactory scores on a standardized test of basic skills acceptable to the Board. Subsequently, the California Achievement Test, Level 19, was recommended by the Commissioner of Education and approved by the Board. Required areas were reading comprehension, language mechanics and expression, and mathematics computation. Minimum scores set by the Board fell in stanine 5 and at or above the 50th percentile based on national norms for grades 9.3 - 9.5.

Reaction to this directive was immediate, mixed, and at times rather heated. The public was delighted and said that the directive was timely. Some

asked about teachers already on the job. Several institutional officials contended that admission requirements for preparation programs were institutional prerogatives. The Board countered that its power to approve or disapprove preparation programs included admission matters. The Board's viewpoint prevailed. The Tennessee Council of Education Deans supported the elevated admission requirements but opposed the particular test adopted, predicting, accurately as it turned out, that the decision would boomerang by the public expressing dismay at "ninth-grade level" requirements for college sophomores preparing to become teachers.

To the surprise of some and the dismay of many, the mandated tests did prevent some Tennessee students from preparing to be teachers - at least in Tennessee institutions. Some students reportedly went across the state line for their preparation and came back to teach in Tennessee. Others were merely delayed and later met the minimum scores upon retesting. To no one's surprise, institutions with significant concentrations of minority and low-income students showed higher rates of failure, or, stated the other way, lower rates of admissibility.

In the spring of 1979, the State Board of Education reevaluated the CAT-Basic Skills Test requirement with expressed intentions to significantly increase the minimum scores required for admission to any approved teacher education program in the state. That the state was continuing the certification of teachers prepared out-of-state was still being ignored, as was the previously raised question regarding any effort to similarly validate the competency of teachers already on the job.

The Council of Education Deans did not oppose the Board's decision per se, but pointed out to the Board that the matter was perhaps more complex than they seemed to think and that the decision would have great impact on minority and

disadvantaged students, on institutions already experiencing decreased enrollments, and on several other aspects of education. The State Board asked the deans to prepare a position paper on the matter.

The plan prepared by the deans was approved by the Board on November 9, 1979, and called for (a) increasing cut-off scores over a three-year period to twelfth-grade norms at the 75th percent level, (b) allowing institutions to substitute a 17 ACT composite score for the required CAT scores, and (c) formulating a clearly-stated procedure for retesting, including a requirement of remedial efforts between testing periods.

3. In 1978, the Board of Education became interested in competency-based education. A group of deans, professors, principals, and classroom teachers were asked to identify competencies needed by elementary school teachers. The Board adopted the group's report, thus requiring preparing institutions to revise their curricula in elementary education so as to ensure the attainment of the specified competencies by students preparing to teach in the elementary grades.

4. In 1979, the Board passed, again without advanced notice, a requirement that all applicants for teacher certification must take the National Teacher Examinations (Commons) and furnish the Board a report of scores attained. Cut-off scores were not set at the time, pending sufficient normative data being accumulated. Cut-off scores were not set until shortly after the passage of CERA in 1984. Scores on area tests currently available for the various subject fields in which the teacher applicant requested certification were also required. Again it became apparent that the Board had not fully anticipated the complexity or the consequences of its decision. For example, at that time Tennessee offered certificate endorsements in about 30 areas for which the NTE had no specialized tests. Implementation of this requirement has been

postponed.

5. In its 1981 session, the Tennessee legislature got into the business of teacher education. Seemingly unaware of the Board's 1979 decision requiring NTE scores as a condition of certification, the legislature passed a bill requiring the State Board of Education to establish procedures adequate to ensure that all graduates of teacher education presented "satisfactory scores" on standardized tests which "assure" competency in basic skills and the area(s) of education in which they were planning to teach. Details were to be worked out by the Board. Little action on the matter took place until the Comprehensive Education Reform Act of 1984.

6. In 1982 the legislature got further involved in teacher education, this time over a State Board ruling which had permitted a local school board member to count three-years' experience on the board as three years of teaching experience, thus becoming eligible to run for office as superintendent. A bill was passed which made the determination of requirements for superintendents' certificate a legislature prerogative. The bill also reduced requirements from a sixth-year level (two years of graduate study) back to the fifth-year level, the Master's degree. Five years of successful hard work by several professional groups that had gotten the Board to elevate the requirements to two years of graduate study were wiped out by this legislative action.

In summary, during the period 1975-80 the State Board of Education became relatively active in generating new requirements and in developing monitoring strategies which it believed would improve the competency of teachers entering the profession. Similarly, toward the end of this period the General Assembly became relatively active in teacher education. The actions by both agencies were aimed in the right direction and perhaps would have been unnecessary if the State Department and preparing institutions had pushed harder and more

successfully for increased admission and program requirements.

Improvements Efforts, 1981-82

In a two-year period just prior to Governor Alexander's 1983 announcement of the Better Schools Program, there were three developments of significance. First, the Governor publicly embraced a project which had been recently initiated by the State Department of Education entitled "Back to Basics." He visited many school systems to promote the program and used the project's objectives as a theme for several addresses. In response to negative reactions from teachers, who contended that they had never gotten away from the basics, the title of the project's name was changed to "Basics First." Within a few weeks the title was extended to include the words "Computer Skills Next."

The Governor's use of this extended slogan signalled his entry into the arena of educational reform. His promotional efforts become highly visible. Schools and colleges of education were quickly brought into the project, following a strongly worded plea by the Governor to both public higher education governing boards. Schools of education were asked to assist area schools in organizing and conducting inservice educational programs designed to achieve the objectives of the project. Over one hundred teacher educators throughout the state quicky became involved in the movement.

Second, concerns about the quality of teacher education in the State began to surface. In March, 1982, the State Board of Regents established a Task Force on the Improvement of Quality in Teacher Education. The major areas of concern cited in the establishment of the Task Force were:

(1) Categories of knowledge, skills, and appreciations that primary and secondary school students should possess at the completion of their studies.

(2) The relationship between current and projected supply and demand for

teachers.

(3) Requirements and procedures for preparing and credentialing teachers.

The membership of the Task Force consisted of two representatives from each of the SBR universities (one from the education faculty and one from the liberal arts faculty), a liaison representative of a community college, and one representative from the staff of the State Board of Regents.

The Task Force studied three components of teacher education programs, then set forth recommendations in each of the areas, namely:

(1) the overall curriculum of teacher education programs,

(2) the field laboratory/clinical) experiences in which teacher education students should engage, and

(3) the requirements for admission, progression within, and graduation from teacher education programs.

The Task Force identified four sets of conditions which it believed to be inextricably related to teacher education and which, therefore, would be powerful determinants as to whether or not improvements would be made in teacher education programs in the state. The four sets of conditions were:

(1) the quality of preparation of high school graduates electing to prepare for teaching careers,

(2) teacher certification policies, procedures, and requirements at both the preservice and inservice levels,

(3) the level of commitment to and the adequacy of provisions made for funding, cooperative planning, research and development in teacher education (including the appropriate involvement of key groups and agencies such as local systems, the State Department of Education, higher education governing boards and regulatory/coordinating

agencies and the departments, colleges and schools of education),

(4) the adequacy of salary and benefit policies and procedures for attracting to teacher education programs, and subsequently to the teaching profession, higher precentages of students who have the personal and academic capacity for being trained to become effective teachers.

The Task Force concluded, among other things, that the quality of instruction offered in Tennessee schools would be improved only by improving all factors which impact on the instructional program, the adequacy of teacher preparation programs being a major one, but only one.

Shortly after the SBR Task Force was underway, the Board of Trustees of the University of Tennessee System activated a task force with a similar composition and set of objectives. The two studies were coordinated at the systems level and reported similar findings and needs. Findings and recommendations from the two studies were subsequently considered by the two systems, the Division of Teacher Education and Certification of the State Department of Education, and the Tennessee Higher Education Commission.

Third, during the first few years of the 1980s, serious thought-provoking situations were emerging which caused leaders in government and education to ponder about the future of education. An economic recession with acompanying unemployment, the decline in certain areas of heavy industry, and the emergence of high technology industries were conditions that received attention. The decreasing cost of computerized information processing and the increasing reliance by government and business on data treatment, storage, and rapid retrieval were also matters receiving attention.

Governmental, business, and educational leaders were mindful also that in Tennessee the largest expenditure of public funds (47.2 percent in 1980-81) was

being appropriated to public education. The total population of the state had increased approximately 11 percent during the last decade and there were projections that the corresponding public education enrollments would begin to increase during the latter portion of this decade. Thus, even with a slightly reduced inflation rate, the cost of public education was projected to increase significantly during the period 1980-90.

Public confidence in government and education appeared to be low, exercerbated by attempts in several states to place a ceiling on taxation. Adding to the dilemma, the role of the federal government was declining sharply, resulting in more funding pressure directed to the state. State governors and legislators were feeling these pressures and were emerging as more dominant forces in determining the future of public education than in the past. Very significantly, the push for increased funding from the state was being countered with the proposition that before additional taxes were imposed, there must be assurances that they would result in better schools. A statewide survey revealed the public's perception of public education. Results were: fair (42.3 percent), good (32.2 percent), poor (19.8 percent), excellent (less than one percent), and no opinion (4.8 percent).

It was with this set of conditions and perceptions in mind that in May, 1981, the Tennessee General Assembly passed Senate Joint Resolution No. 46, a piece of enabling legislation for the Tennessee Comprehensive Education Study. This was a timely move for reasons cited above and inasmuch as twenty-five years had elapsed since the last comprehensive study of public education in Tennessee.

A report of the study was made in December, 1932. It contained a long list of recommendations categorized according to four major areas of concern: Goals, Governance, Quality, and Fund Distribution. All segments of public

education were included in the study and thus in the recommendations.

It is noteworthy that recommendations designed to improve the quality of education in Tenenssee included a separate section on teacher preparation, both short-term and long-term. Essentially, the recommendations called for: (1) increased admission and graduation requirements, (2) increased use of field-based classroom experiences, (3) establishment of on-going evaluations by the respective governing boards of existing preparation programs and means for assessing the need for and the quality and productivity of all teacher preparation programs and specialties, eliminating unnecessary duplication, (4) the issuance of temporary endorsements to teachers in "surplus" fields to teach math and science, with specified "refresher" courses to be taken within the year, (5) establishment of the rank of "lead teacher" to act as mentor for new and student teachers, (6) provision for lead teachers, with assistance of teacher educators, to provide inservice education programs to enhance the skills of current teachers, and (7) the certification of new teachers only after competency has been demonstrated during a year's internship with a "lead teacher."

As will be seen later, these recommendations were very similar in wording and intent to several provisions in Governor Aelxander's Better Schools Program.

The Comprehensive Education Reform Act of 1984

On January 29, 1983, Governor Lamar Alexander addressed the Tennessee Press Association in a live, statewide telecast labeled by him as "the most important statement of my eight years as Governor." The speech was devoted entirely to a description of a Better Schools Program, a 10-point program which he presented forthwith to the General Assembly scheduled to reconvene a few weeks later. The ten points included in the Better Schools Program were as

follows:

1. Basic Skills First - A teacher-designed new elementary curriculum already in 11,366 classrooms throughout the state and consisting of 1,300 skills in reading and math, 680 of which must be learned. By 1990, every child except those severely handicapped would be required to pass the Basic Skills First eighth-grade competency test before entering the ninth grade.

2. Computer Skills Next - Every child will know basic computer skills before the ninth grade.

3. Kindergarten for Every Child - Every child must start school at the kindergarten level, even if the child does not start school until age six.

4. More High School Math and Science - Double the existing requirement of one credit of senior high school math and one of science and provide funds for the extra teachers.

5. Special Residential Summer Schools for Gifted Juniors and Seniors - An effort to reward academic excellence, not just athletic excellence.

6. Redefine the High School Vocational Education Curriculum - Tie it more closely to the jobs of the 80's and provide more adequate equipment.

7. Classroom Discipline - Alternative schools for students who disrupt classrooms and the creation of a state-paid liability insurance program for teachers and all other school personnel.

8. Adult Job Skill Training (Post-Secondary Level Vocational - Technical Education) under the Board of Regents - The state's 40 community colleges, technical institutes and area vocational schools should have a single overall management. Most citizens over 21 will be going back to school at some point to brush up on basic skills, learn computer skills, and acquire new job skills.

9. Centers of Excellence in Universities - First-rate financing for

first-rate programs and better overall support for good teaching and research. In the 1980's, good universities will spin off the ideas that spin off new jobs.

- Music in the Early Grades - With budgets so tight, this could not be made a top ten priority. But a small state base of support will be provided and additional money will be raised privately to keep Tennessee's musical heritage in Tennessee's schools.

10. The MASTER TEACHER PROGRAM and MASTER PRINCIPAL PROGRAM - The most important of all. An incentive pay system that will make teaching a fully professional career, draw the best young people into teaching, keep the best teachers and challenge them to do even better, and inspire excellence in Tennessee classrooms by rewarding the excellence of its teachers.

The proposed Better Schools Program was one of the best kept secrets in modern Tennessee political history. Educational and political leaders alike were caught by surprise, a factor which may have contributed to the program's difficulty in the General Assembly. Coming only one month after the Report of the Comprehensive Education Study, the proposed Better Schools Program bore strong similarity to the recommendations of the study.

Reaction to the Better Schools Program was immediate and mixed. There was positive support for the program overall, especially from business leaders. Several educational leaders applauded the proposal as being bold, fresh, imaginative, and unique in regard to the proposed incentive teacher pay plan on a statewide basis. The Tennessee Education Association supported several of the ten points, were neutral on a few, but objected strenuously to the master teacher and master principal component. In fact, TEA got legislative sponsorship for a bill of its own. The prepared bill was not enacted into law.

The legislation written to enact the Better Schools Program into law was

sponsored on a bi-partisan basis and assigned to the Senate Education Committee. Intense debate ensued, both in the Committee and throughout the state, centering primarily around the Master Teacher-Master Principal Program.

Only one of the ten parts of the proposed program was enacted into law by the 1983 General Assembly; namely, the placement of technical institutes and area vocational schools under the governance of the State Board of Regents. The Senate Education Committee, by a 5 to 4 vote, postponed action on the remaining nine parts until the 1984 session of the General Assembly. A House-Senate Joint Committee was appointed to study the postponed programs, the recommendations form the Comprehensive Education study, and other related matters and to propose legislation around these matters for consideration by the 1984 General Assembly. An Interim Certification Commission was established by the Governor and charged with the identification of evaluation criteria along with policies and procedures necessary for the Master Teacher - Master Principal Program to become operational if approved by the 1984 General Assembly.

Another surprise was to come later. Expectations were that the Better Schools legislation would receive top billing in the regular session of the 1984 General Assembly, scheduled to convene in February. To the surprise of many, on January 4, 1984, the Governor issued a call for the General Assembly to convene in Extraordinary Session on January 10 for the sole purpose of considering the recommendations emanating from the Select Joint Committee on Education. The Joint Committee's numerous recommendations had as their centerpiece a career ladder program for teachers and administrators, in fact, for all certificated professional personnel in grades K-12 except superintendents. The proposed career ladder program was a revised and somewhat less controversial version of the Master Teacher - Master Principal Program

proposed a year earlier by the Governor.

This extraordinary session of the legislature resulted in two landmark enactments: The Comprehensive Education Reform Act of 1984 and an Education Governance Act changing the composition, role and function of the Tennessee State Board of Education. Highly significant and very much apropos to this paper, 11 of the 105 sections of the CERA dealt specifically with teacher education, while many of the remaining 94 sections posed clear and significant implications for teacher education at both the preservice and inservice level.

The major provision of the two acts are explicated and described briefly in the following pages.

The new legislation appropriated more than one billion new dollars to public education during the next three years, with $401 million allocated for 1984-85. The heart of the reform package, the career leader program for teachers and administrators, gave Tennessee the nation's first comprehensive, statewide career incentive pay system for K-12 school personnel. The new career ladder program has several key features:

- A five-step career ladder - from entry level probationary teacher to Career Level III - with corresponding pay supplements ranging from $1,000 to $7,000 annually over and above the person's regular salary.
- Advancement up the career ladder is tied to rigorous evaluations at both the local level (for probationary, apprentice, and Level I teacher) and at the state level (for Career Levels II and III).
- A "probationary" entry year for new teachers prior to regular state certification followed by three years as apprentice teacher, thus giving local school authorities four years to evaluate teachers before tenure decisions are made.

- Special extra pay supplements for apprentice-level teachers (Years 2-4) designed to serve as incentives for highly qualified young people to enter teaching and to remain in it.
- Establishment of a new statewide certification commission (and three subordinate regional commissions) composed of representatives from all segments of the education profession along with lay persons. The commission is charged with developing evaluation criteria, procedures and policies for operating the career ladder system.
- A stronger and more clearly specified role for local school leaders in the evaluation of teachers and recommending them for certification.

The reform legislation included several provisions in addition to the career ladder program. Several of the more significant provisions are listed below:

- Increased standards for teacher training (identified and elaborated in a later section).
- Employment of teacher aides in the lower grades at a cost of $6.5 million in 1984-85.
- A 10% increase in across-the-board salary for teachers (apart from and in addition to the $50 million career ladder program).
- A restructured State Board of Education designed to assure lay governance of public education. (The Public School Governance Act)
- Extension of the school year by five additional days mandated for classroom instruction.
- A scholarship/loan forgiveness program for persons planning careers as teachers of science and math.
- $9 million for the Computer Skills Next program to purchase computers for local schools and to help students learn to use them before high

school.

- $1.25 million for first-grade readiness (making kindergarten programs available to all pre-schoolers).
- $3.5 million to employ more math and science teachers.
- $1.4 million in new funding for programs for gifted students, music and art in the early grades, and more math and science laboratory equipment.
- $8.5 million for new equipment for the vocational education program.
- $1.25 million for alternative schools to promote classroom discipline.
- $10 million for Centers of Excellence in state supported universities.
- Increased appropriations for instructional supplies, textbooks, transportation, basic maintenance and operation, books for regional libraries.
- Establishment of a Principal-Administrator Academy to conduct a wide array of educational and training programs for school leaders. A program of the State Department of Education, training will be held in various sites throughout the state.
- Stronger and clearer directives concerning inservice education, including the specification of five (5) days (within the 200-day school year) for this purpose, with the requirement that locally developed plans must (1) link staff development activities to the Career Ladder Program, (2) be approved by the State Department of Education according to state guidelines, and (3) place top priority to the needs of beginning teachers (probationary and apprentice).

An interesting (and believed to be precedent setting) feature of the CERA was the setting forth of numerous goals for education with the stated expectation that the goals would be attained within five years after passage of the Act. The goals are comprehensive in nature and apply to most aspects of

public education, K-12 and post-secondary. Several of the goals pertain to teacher education and teacher placement and assignment. Stated below in summarized forms are the goals set forth by the Act, including those directly pertaining to teacher education.

1. Each institution of higher learning shall establish annually measurable benchmarks as well as a list of specific achievements to be realized by the end of the fifth year and present them to the special committee of the General Assembly created by the Act. Where possible, these benchmarks and goals must have the complete agreement of the State Board of Regents, the University of Tennessee Board of Trustees, and the Higher Education Commission for the various campuses of higher education in the state of Tennessee.

2. Attainment of the following four sub-goals within five years after passage of the Act:

   (A) A 20% decrease in the percentage of students who enter high school but who do not graduate from high school.

   (B) An improvement in performance shown by a 10% decrease in the percent of students failing the state proficiency test in each subject at the 9th and 12th grades.

   (C) A relative increase in test scores of students who take the SAT or ACT tests, such increases expected to enable Tennessee students to rank higher than the national average in each and every subject area or category.

   (D) A 15% increase in the number of students mastering each skill in reading and mathematics as measured on the Basic Skills criterion-referenced tests in grades 3, 6, and 8.

3. Within five (5) years after passage of the Act the instructional program

shall have been upgraded to provide measurable improvement in the subjects of Chapter II "The Basic Academic Competencies," Chapter III "Computer Competency: An Emerging Need," and Chapter IV "The Basic Academic Subjects" (all as set out in Academic Preparation for College: What Students Need to Know and be Able to Do, published by the College Board, 888 Seventh Avenue, New York, New York, 10106, 1983).

4. An increase in the percentage of students who enter four-year university degree programs and who subsequently earn baccalaureate degrees.

5. An increase in the scores of public university entry-level students on the composite tests of ACT and SAT.

6. An improvement in standardized examination scores of graduating seniors at public universities.

7. An increase in the number of students from public universities who pass all parts of professional licensing examinations on the first attempt in fields for which a licensure examination is required.

8. An improvement in test scores of students entering graduate schools within public universities as measured by such national examinations as the GRE.

9. An increase in the measured knowledge of graduates of public university graduate and professional programs.

10. An improvement in the library holdings of the public technical institutes, community colleges, and universities.

11. For those universities whose defined role includes research, an improvement in the ranking of the public universities' research activities as measured by additional external grants and gifts received for sponsored research (recognizing, however, that changes in federal research policies are beyond the control of individual institutions or the state of Tennessee).

12. An improvement in the support given to public universities' public service

programs as measured by additional external funds received for such activities.

13. An improvement in the job placement rate by specific vocational fields studied for all vocational graduates of area vocational schools, technical institutes, and community colleges.

14. An improvement in the correlation of specific vocational fields of study offered by area vocational schools, technical institutes, and community colleges with the specific vocational needs of each service area of the state as determined by projections of the State Departments of Planning, Employment Security, Economic and Community Development.

15. The implementation by public universities of policies which insure that no credit will be offered for courses which provide remediation for high school deficiencies will apply toward minimum degree requirements for graduation.

16. A reduction in those courses now offered for degree credit by public technical institutes and community colleges which serve as remediation for high school deficiencies (recognizing, however, that until such time as the basic skills possessed by all high school graduates in Tennessee are significantly improved, institutions will continue to have a significant remediation responsibility).

As stated earlier, 11 of the 105 sections of CERA pertained to teacher education and several of the goals set forth in the Act pertained to teacher preparation, retention, and placement. Provisions of the Act which dealt directly with teacher education are summarized below:

1. While acknowledging the intention to maintain a balance between the academic freedom of higher education and the need to respond to the public's expectation of quality in the state's teacher training programs, and not wishing to impose restrictions on the philosophy or course selection in such programs, the legislature reserved the authority

to require of each preparation program reasonable admission and graduation requirements as set forth in the CERA.

2. Students entering teacher training programs at state institutions shall continue to be required to submit a satisfactory score on the California Achievement Test or the Pre-Professional Skills Test. Beginning with the 1985-86 academic year, a candidate shall also be required to achieve a passing score on a standardized test of written composition. These tests shall be secure and shall be developed or acquired by the Department of Education, validated, and administered by the Department at each institution or made available through the regular administration offered by a national testing organization.*
3. In order to assure the public that every new teacher has been adequately trained, teaching certificates shall be issued only to those students who are graduates from a Tennessee institution certified by the State Department of Education or from an out-of-state institution certified by the state in which it is located. If the state in which an institution is located does not certify its institutions, the State Department of Education may do so consistent with standards applicable to Tennessee institutions.
4. Teacher education students shall spend a significant portion of three (3) academic quarters involved in classroom observation and teaching, such observation beginning in the sophomore year. Each student shall be assigned to a tenured teacher for guidance, evaluation, and instruction.
5. As soon as appropriate validation and standard-setting studies have been completed and the minimum qualifying score by which prospective

*As indicated earlier, the CAT was adopted in 1978 as a required test. Effective December 1, 1984, the P-PST will be used in lieu of the CAT, provided the State Board approves the recommendation of the Commissioner of Education.

teachers entering the teaching profession after July 1, 1984, may enter the new certification system has been adopted for each test and announced by the State Certification Commission, all students receiving certification must have passed both a core test that measures basic communication skills, general knowledge, and professional knowledge, and a standardized or criterion-referenced test for the desired area of endorsement. These tests shall be developed or acquired by the Department of Education, validated and administered by the department at each institution or made available through the regular administration offered by a national testing organization. These tests shall be secure and shall be in lieu of the test prescribed earlier by the legislature (the old form of the NTE).

6. Graduates of teacher education programs who achieve a passing score on the state teachers examination are eligible to be awarded a certificate by the State Board of Education as probationary teachers and may apply for employment in the school system of their choice. Once a passing score has been achieved and the student has received a certificate as a probationary teacher, the same test shall not be required for advancement from one career level to another.

7. Prior to the issuance of certification as an apprentice teacher, each probationary teacher must teach for a normal school year under the supervision of two tenured teachers assigned by the principal. If possible, at least one of the two tenured teachers shall teach in the probationary teacher's area of specialization. At the end of the school year the candidate's evaluations will be sent to the local board of education, which will submit to the State Certification Commission a recommendation for issuance or denial of (continuing) certification.

In making their decision, the State Certification Commission and the State Board of Education must consider the recommendation of the local board of education. The State Certification Commission and the State Board of Education shall be notified by the superintendent of schools of any out-of-school business, and any blood, or marriage relationship between the probationary teacher and any employee of the local school system.

8. Beginning in 1986, the State Board of Education shall annually review the scores on the state teachers examination from each public and private teacher training institution. Any institution which had thirty percent (30%) or more of its students fail the examination for the previous year shall be so informed and placed on temporary probation. Any institution which has thirty percent (30%) or more of its student fail in two (2) consecutive years shall have its state certification (approved program status) revoked by the State Board of Education. An institution may regain its certification when seventy percent (70%) of those students taking the examination in an academic year achieve a passing score.
9. Course requirements for subject area endorsements which certified teachers wish to acquire shall be based upon the same requirements as the initial endorsements. At the discretion of the State Certification Commission, credit shall be allowed for appropriate course work taken for initial certification. These course requirements shall be from upper division courses, or above, and from four-year institutions.
10. Beginning in the 1986-87 academic year, all courses taken toward meeting the requirements for a teacher endorsement shall be selected from those courses required for an academic major in the various fields of the arts and sciences (or from colleges of business or engineering, if applicable). This requirement shall not apply to standard methods

courses or other courses designed especially for training elementary teachers.

11. All full-time college of education faculty members, including deans, are required to further their professional development through direct personal involvement in the public schools on a periodic basis. Such involvement shall take the form of inservice training activities for public school teachers, observation and evaluation of student teachers, or classroom instruction in a public school.

As indicated earlier, the several goals set forth in CERA coverd teacher education as well as K-12 matters. Two of the goals dealt with teacher education, as follows:

1. The State Board of Education, the Tennessee Higher Education Commission, the State Board of Regents, and the University of Tennessee Board of Trustees shall designate subcommittees to meet jointly at least annually for stuctured meetings to coordinate policy on matters of mutual interest about teacher education matters. An appropriate representative body of the approved private colleges and universities training teachers in Tennessee shall be invited to participate.
2. Within two years after the effective date of this act, the State Board of Education, in cooperation with the State Certification Commission and the Tennessee Higher Education Commission, shall cause a study or studies to be made of the following matters:
    (a) the sufficiency of existing teacher training programs and components with a view toward successful integration of liberal arts courses, teaching level specialities and a professional curriculum;
    (b) the preparation, training and experience of higher education

faculty engaged in teacher training programs with a view toward determining appropriate criteria and personnel standards and the sufficiency of those standards; and

(c) the adoption of a student teaching practicum to offer direct, substantial, quality participation in teaching at the elementary and secondary teaching level over an extended period of time and under the supervision of college and elementary or secondary based personnel. When completed, these studies and any appropriate recommendations shall be filed with the appropriate Senate and House standing committees.

Summary

Recent efforts made in Tennessee to reform education can be usefully grouped into three time frames: (1) those efforts which occured during the period 1975-80, (2) those made in 1981-1982, and (3) those attempted in 1983 but made in 1984 in the Comprehensive Education Reform Act.

In the first of the three periods, both the State Board of Education and the General Assembly heightened their concerns about problems, issues and needs in public education (including teacher education) and, relatively speaking, promulgated considerably more policies, procedures and regulations. It was in this period, for example, that competency testing for both high school graduation and admission to teacher education programs was mandated. In retrospect, it is clear that these two governmental agencies were laying the groundwork for more extensive and comprehensive educational reform efforts which, as it turned out, were to come in 1984.

Local boards of education were less active than the State Board and the General Assembly in educational reform efforts during this five-year period. State mandates and directives were accepted as implemented without a great deal

of opposition, but there is little documented evidence that the changes were applauded, much less extended. Schools, colleges and departments of education exhibited similar responses to state initiatives affecting teacher education. The changes were implemented, and a few of the SCDEs affected changes beyond those required by state agencies. For the most part, however, it is accurate to say that the reform efforts made between 1975-80 were conceived and initiated at the state level.

The next era of efforts toward educational reform, 1981-82, was also focused at the state level. The General Assembly authorized, funded and caused to be conducted a Comprehensive Education Study, the first such study in the state in a quarter of a century. Among the Study's many recommendations were nine which related directly to teacher education, the concept of "lead teacher" being one of them. Later, in 1983, the concept was proposed by Governor Alexander as "Master Teacher." A year later the concept was enacted into law in the form of a Career Ladder Program. Other significant developments during this reform era were task forces on teacher education conducted by the two public higher education governing boards and the Basic Skills First program embraced by the Governor and carried the length and breadth of the state by him.

The Comprehensive Education Reform Act of 1984 was a landmark in the history of education in Tennessee. In many respects the Act was a revised version of Governor Alexander's Better Schools Program presented to the 1983 General Assembly but postponed for one year by the Senate Education Committee. The CERA was far and away the state's most comprehensive and ambitious effort to improve education in the history of the state. It called for the largest increase in state funds allocated to education by any previous session of the General Assembly and the largest single tax increase earmarked for schools by

any session of the Assembly.

Reform provisions covered both K-12 and higher education. The legislation reflected two legislative attitudes which had become apparent in Tennessee (as well as in several other states); namely, that (1) taxes and appropriations for education should be increased only if accompanied by good assurances that attempts at school improvement would not be "business as usual" and "more of the same, and (2) that ways be identified and specified for educators and boards of education to be held accountable for their efforts to a much higher degree than heretofore. The Tennessee Comprehensive Education Reform Act of 1984 achieved both of these objectives. The Act established a bold and ambitious career ladder program for all certificated public school educators except superintendents. Salaries were increased across the board by 10%, in addition to supplements for teachers in the probationary years (2-4) and supplements up to $7,000 annually for teachers and administrators rising to the top rung of the career ladder.

Teacher education was delt with extensively in the CERA. Admission and exit requirements were elevated and specified. Provisions were made whereby continued program approval will be dependent upon 70% or more of an institution's graduates achieving satisfactory scores on the National Teacher Examinations.

Unique in Tennessee legislation action, and perhaps with respect to legislation passed in other states, the Act set forth goals which are expected to be achieved within five years after passage of the Act. Several of the goals pertained directly to teacher education and virtually all of them have implications for the preparation of teachers and administrators.

Finally, the Act established a Legislative Oversight Committee and charged it with continuing responsibilities believed to be necessary to assure that the

state's mammoth effort to reform education in Tennessee will be productive and that it will endure.

RLS/

9-20-84